The Reply

An Anti-Suffrage Magazine

Second Year | November, 1914 | Number Five

CONTENTS OF THIS NUMBER

"Why I am Opposed to Woman Suffrage" *Hon. Harold A. Hinman*

"Teacher-Mothers" *John B. Huber, A.M., M.D.*

"Women Do Not Want the Suffrage" *Gilbert M. Tucker*

Mrs. Catt and the Leslie Million; Or, Now You See It and Now You Don't

Mormonism as the Mainstay of Suffragism in the Inter-Mountain Country

Miss Margaret Foley and Her Rough and Drunken Miners of Nevada

Hon. Herbert Parsons as the Great White Boss of New York Suffragists

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS JAN 15 1915

Any bright boy, or any bright girl, can make a little extra money by applying by mail to the

BUSINESS MANAGER, THE REPLY

27 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK

with the purpose of increasing the subscription list of the magazine.

There is no bright boy nor any bright girl but ought to try it.

J. B. Thill

and

Mrs. Edmond W. Bodine

Real Estate

192 Main Street
NEW ROCHELLE, N. Y.
Telephone 848

30 East Forty-Second Street
NEW YORK CITY
Telephone 6364 Murray Hill

TWO IMPORTANT ANTI-SUFFRAGE BOOKS

An Englishwoman's Home

Crown 8 vo.
Price by mail, 50c.
By M. E. S.

Mixed Herbs

A Working Woman's Remonstrance Against the Suffrage Agitation

Crown 8 vo.
Price by mail, 75c.
By the Same Author

London, Sampson Low, Marston & Co., Ltd.
Agent for United States

THE REPLY

27 William St. New York

Oh! Lady will you stop
At the "Little Vanity Shop?"

Take a Peep at

Blouses, Gowns

Fresh from Paris

THE LITTLE VANITY SHOP

346 Madison Avenue

AT 44TH STREET NEW YORK

One Block from Grand Central Station

Parcels Post makes shopping by mail easy. Why not write as well as visit our advertisers?

The Reply

Edited and Published by Helen S. Harman-Brown

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 27 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK CITY
Subscription Price: $1 Per Year; 10 Cents the Copy

Entered as second-class matter May 9, 1914, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879

The Reply is on sale at Brentano's, Fifth Avenue and Twenty-seventh Street, New York, and at Brentano's, Twelfth and F Streets, Washington

Editorial Notes

The Anti-Suffrage Review (of London) shows the right editorial sense of proportion by saying in reference to certain elections in the United States: "Suffragist organs claim that two states pronounced in favor of it (female suffrage), Montana with a population equal to that of Bristol, and Nevada with a smaller population than Reading."

It is evident that Mrs. Dorr (Rheta, yes, Rheta, probably) will require a suffrage censor and may be entirely deleted. She complains that the suffs lost the fight in Nebraska because of "the lazy suffragists who could not lend a hand because they had their home mission meetings, or their club meeting, or their bridge party, to look after—and it was those women who knocked our amendment in the head."

In Massachusetts there are 1,100,000 women of voting age, yet only 40,000 have been interested enough to join the suffrage cause, and half of these have come in, not because they really wanted to, but because the most underhanded methods have been constantly used to "induce" them to join. In other words, they have been forced in through personal friendship, and the cowardice which some women show when implored to "join us" because of personal friendship. So, as a matter of fact, not more than 20,000 out of 1,100,000 women in Massachusetts really care a continental about voting; yet the 20,000 (or, rather, the 200 active leaders and paid agitators) want to force the ballot upon more than a million women who have no use for it, and don't want it.

William J. Burns, detective, whose name no one has ever seen in the papers, aroused the listening suffs at the Suffrage Shop to an aerial degree of elation by telling them that the woman detective would come right along after the woman officeholder, and she would be a bird, or words to that effect.

But now come reports of a sad catastrophe in Indiana. Muncie's "millionaire policewoman," Mrs. Thomas F. Hart, has resigned. Mrs. Hart joined the force a year ago to help wayward girls. She wore

a uniform and carried a mace. Her health, she now says, will not permit her to continue the work.

There is also an expert witness for Detective Burns much nearer home; in fact, we have the lady right in New York. One of the Hearst papers describes how virtue is its own reward again. It appears that Mrs. Ida B. Riley McKinney, wife of Andrew McKinney, member of the Stock Exchange and a well-known broker, started out bravely to get evidence for a divorce, but at the crucial moment, when she was supposed to knock on the door of a room where it was expected the evidence would be obtained, her nerve failed her and she sat in a state of nervous collapse in her limousine while her butler and two private detectives took her place.

How suitable for another moving picture drama!

Compare the six suffrage states of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Washington, California and Idaho with the six nearest male-suffrage states with approximately the same area (North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Montana and Nevada), and it appears that the six suffrage states have only 37 per cent of their population living in dry territory while the six male-suffrage states have 70 per cent in dry territory.

Mrs. Voole, a suffragist who has been very active in the Ohio Campaign, says, "Some of our best meetings have been held in front of saloons."

There seems to be no length to which the suffragist will not go in advertising her shame to the world. They melt up their wedding rings, and the thimbles which their mothers wore and left to them, and even the silver cups out of which they drank as babies. To them it signifies nothing, of course. Bernard Shaw explains it; to succeed a woman mustn't care for anything.

Naturally, every woman who feeds a priceless treasure into the melting pot shows by that act that it is not priceless at all. True, these women might not give up their wedding gifts, their beautiful silver dishes, their "quaint lovely old Dutch perfume bottles," their amethyst hearts, "which they so hate to part with," or the apron "which she herself wove," if the names of the self-denying givers were not to get into the papers. All the same, the self-advertising feature of it, taken with the so-called self-sacrificing feature, can only denote a double degradation.

This doubly amusing and detestable as well as widely published throwing of fits took a novel turn in the case of Miss Lavinia Dock. Yet there was nothing strange about it. Miss Dock is of the Nurses' Settlement, and went among the people of the East Side, "for whom she worked so long"; and she came back weighted down with salt bags of pennies, nickels and dimes, and her satchel was running over with signed yellow slips."

Nothing can be safe in close proximity to such; they would rob a child of candy.

A valued correspondent writes THE REPLY that he is laughing heartily over Mrs. Oliver Hazard Perry Belmont's observation, "I insist that woman suffrage is a spiritual movement." He has known Mrs. Belmont personally, he says.

THE REPLY desires to express its sympathy for Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt if, in this recent discussion of the size and destination of Mrs. Frank Leslie's million dollars for suffrage, the lady—Mrs. Catt, not Mrs. Leslie—has been torn with conflicting emotions. For at some times it has seemed as if you saw it, and as if

Mrs. Catt might, and then at other times it has appeared as if you didn't see it—and as if Mrs. Catt might not. If it will console Mrs. Catt at all, we will apply to this interesting phenomenon—sincerely for the real benefit of Mrs. Catt, of course—the law of compensation.

If it is true that Mrs. Catt has Mrs. Leslie's million or will some time get it, then she will be, and even now must be, very important indeed, not only in the eyes of all the self-sacrificing suffragists who ornament the pay-roll, but in the view of society as well; for a woman, whether wife or widow, possessing a million dollars to do with as she will, possesses also a great importance everywhere. On the other hand, if Mrs. Catt hasn't the Leslie million and is not to get it, then the very fact that she will be less conspicuous and important will be a comfort or can be made one; for those who have cared for her because of her new-found opulence and influence will be found wanting and will be measured at their true value. And those who ornament the pay-roll of suffragism because self-abnegation is their dominant characteristic may bother others to death, but not Mrs. Catt. We commend these fugitive suggestions to the prayerful attention of the lady. Great wealth involves great responsibility, and a lack of it means freedom, and that is dear to the feminist.

We have never been the least bit frightened to read that Mrs. Leslie was bequeathing a million dollars to Mrs. Catt, or that the New York suffragists were going to raise $150,000 and had already raised $45,000 "on the spot," or that the suffragists lost Nebraska recently because they had only $5,800 to spend in a single county, or that the Connecticut suffragists spent $16,000 last year and thought it but a wretched bank account. Nor has it disturbed us that Miss Blackwell, editor of the *Woman's Journal,* prints a standing invitation to the dying to bequeath their money to Miss Blackwell's particular palladium of our liberties. On the other side of the equation we have had the frank admission of Miss Esther Ogden, a suffrage worker of Elizabeth, who declares that it is impossible to work up an interest in suffrage in New Jersey, and that it is money thrown away to try. Still more significant is the notable case of William Barnes, Jr., of Albany, who looks in at the suffrage headquarters in New York of an idle afternoon and slips a nimble dollar to the cash register girl, indicating that this perspicacious political leader—a mere man, it is true—has not been stampeded, at least on the financial end, as yet.

As a matter of fact, the vote cannot be bought for women in New York or anywhere else; and if Mrs. Catt has ever thought that it could, she knows better now; and probably the no less impractical suffragist campaigners of Connecticut, Nebraska and New Jersey have come to the same conclusion. That would also appear to be the mature thought of William Barnes, Jr. Indeed, it is just possible that a stray intimation may have penetrated the heads, of some of these ladies at least, that the question whether or not women ought to have the vote is to be decided by other considerations than the ones which money or the things which money will buy would keep before us. For ourselves, we feel quite positive that the reckless and boastful use of money by the suffragists will have the contrary effect from that which they desire, and therefore we have wished that they would keep it up and would redouble their efforts.

No; we do not believe that money will buy the vote for women in New York or

in any other state. We believe that where one woman, or one man milliner, parades herself shamelessly in the streets, or talks herself red in the face from the tonneau of an automobile at $5 an hour, or hikes bare-legged or half naked out through the villages for men and boys to throw things at, there are a hundred women and a hundred men who are thinking deeply and straight upon this momentous question, and when the time comes those thoughtful men and women will be found influencing the vote or actually casting it, as the case may be, against this wildest and most unaccountable of all recent spasms affecting our politics and society. It is to these men and these women that we would appeal for encouragement, not necessarily to be with us without question, but to consider the subject prayerfully, in order that men may continue to be men, and women women, and men lovers and husbands and fathers, and women sweethearts and wives and mothers.

"If," says the New York *Times*," they cram the vote down the throats of a large part of the United States which does not want it and is even hostile to it, the showing made on the first election day after this mistake is committed will be a body blow to the influence and standing of women in politics."

Many will appreciate the despair of the Washington *Star* in declaring that "a little militancy of the militant suffragette type would be a relief by comparison."

We complain about the high cost of living, but it is the high cost of government that mainly causes the high cost of living; and the high cost of government is made high because of our many thousands of freak laws. If we had woman suffrage, we should have more and more freak legislation and a higher and higher cost of government. Double the number of socialistic voters, double the number of radical voters, and you will add enormously to the mass of useless and expensive legislation, and thereby tremendously increase the cost of government. Woman suffrage would add a staggering burden to the high cost of living.

Undoubtedly it is true, as Mrs. Horace Brock observes, that one of the saddest things about suffrage is its desertion by women with the vote.

Here is Mrs. Ogden Mills Reid, reported in the New York *Tribune* as saying, "There are some things that men do better than women, probably always will do better than women;" from which it must appear that the *Tribune* must shortly lose one of its most accurate reporters.

And here comes Miss M. Carey Thomas, president of Bryn Mawr and an officer of the National Suffrage Association, telling a body of college girls that when women vote marriage will no longer disqualify them from following their life work. She says: "They (women) may have spent half a lifetime in fitting themselves for a scholar's work and then be asked to choose between it and marriage. No one can estimate the number of women who remain unmarried in revolt before such a horrible alternative."

And the good women of Massachusetts, fighting feminism and suffragism successfully, speak of a group of suffragist college girls heard discoursing volubly to a group of college men on "the economic waste of maternity."

THE REPLY would not wish to say or even suggest anything disagreeable, but we wonder whether the Bryn Mawr girls have mothers, or if not mothers, then

guardians; and whether the group of suffragist college girls just referred to could not be located, and if they have mothers or at least guardians. And a further inquiry would be interesting to see, first, whether those mothers or those guardians believe in discouraging marriage, and, second, whether the trustees of these girls' colleges believe in discouraging marriage; for there might be certain old-fashioned men among them who still hold to the notion that the truth is to be taught in girls' colleges as in other colleges, and that there are doubtless presidents of girls' colleges or would-be presidents of girls' colleges who would perhaps prefer, all things considered, to teach the truth rather than falsehood.

"Rev." Anna Shaw begins the second installment of her biography (written apparently by herself) by declaring, "Like most men, my dear father should never have married"; but according to Anna's apparent beliefs as she now expresses them, the dear little thing might just as easily have come into the world by another route—sired by a sunbeam, possibly.

It seems that Mrs. Blatch (Mrs. Harriot Stanton Blatch, daughter of Elizabeth Cady Stanton) was at the recent National Convention of the suffs merely for the purpose of giving a sketch of the life of her mother, Elizabeth Cady Stanton—mother of Harriot Stanton Blatch. Does everybody get it?

An enthusiastic correspondent of the New York *Evening Post* quotes Miss Elinor Byrns, "Press Chairman of the National Association," as she dictated notices in the Land Commissioner's office to the Land Commissioner's stenographer before the Land Commissioner's open fire; indicating that Miss Elinor Byrns, while evidently being solid in some way with the Land Commissioner of Tennessee, whoever he is, would doubtless deny that she had anything on other suffrage ladies, of whom much must be expected when they once come fully into power.

THE REPLY has a new card of advertising rates ready for distribution, and it will be mailed on request to any enquirer. Readers of THE REPLY believe in patronizing its advertisers, just as they find themselves in earnest antagonism to the dangers of female suffragism. REPLY readers, in other words, are men and women who take sides. They patronize REPLY advertisers because they believe it is good business as well as good patriotism to do it.

Mrs. Whitman, wife of the Governor-elect of New York, is strongly for female suffrage, and it is easy to see where Charles will land.

"Poor Jane," of "such a wasted life," has five children, and according to a suffrage correspondent of the *Sun* has little time to play the piano these days. And Jane's neighbors, and she has doubtless many good ones, ought to be thankful that things are looking up so brightly in poor Jane's career.

John Drew, the actor, now joins William Jennings Bryan in coming out for female suffrage, evidently hoping to be the nominee for Vice-President on the all Thespian ticket in 1916.

A Miss Warton tells us how shy she found English suffragists to be. She first describes her own titanic struggles to be set right before the god of things as they are; and then she says:

"I began to realize of what stuff the work-

ers in the movement were made; what price they paid for their services so gladly given; how far removed they were from any taint of self-glorification, and how amazingly they played the game of incessantly advertising the cause without ever developing the curse of self-advertisement. I have never been among people of any sort who were so entirely free from self-consciousness, self-seeking and self-vaunting."

Send to the publisher of THE REPLY the names and addresses of any men and women who, on the one hand, desire good anti-suffrage literature with which to make the fight, or, on the other hand, need for their own political and social salvation a little of the right sort of doctrine now and then.

President Feickert (Madam President Feickert, probably) struck her true gait when she said at the Camden meeting of Jersey suffs, "We had from two to six columns of publicity in the local papers each day."

It is just possible, too, that no pay would have attached to the position of president emeritus of the National suffrage movement.

"Wisconsin, Michigan, and now Ohio," writes Ida Husted Harper, "twice have shown that for various causes a hard struggle is ahead for woman suffrage east of the Mississippi. Probably after it has reached that boundary it will have to turn for a while to the Southern states for its victories."

There will be difficulties there. The *Virginia Pilot* recently observed editorially:

"In exercise of the prerogative (of suffrage) the States of the South proceeded to enact such suffrage laws as have operated to reduce the negro vote within their several jurisdictions to negligible proportions, thus practically eliminating the race issue from politics. To accomplish this it was necessary to hedge about the ballot-box with conditions which, while not essentially discriminative, operated to shut out from the electorate the great body of the ignorant, shiftless and vagrant among the male negro population.

"Are we prepared for such further amendment to the Federal Constitution as would reopen this closed issue? So far as the Virginian-Pilot is concerned, emphatically "No." Nor do we believe that the now ruling elements of any Southern State will ever give approval to an amendment which would transfer control of suffrage and elections within their borders to the Federal Government. Yet that would inevitably follow were the measures advocated by Mrs. Shaw and other leaders of the National Woman's suffrage League to be incorporated into the supreme law of the country. Four million of negro women would become the beneficiaries of such a radical change in our dual system of government, and that is a price which the white women of the South ought to be as unwilling, as are their husbands and brothers, to pay for their own endowment with political equality."

The New Orleans *Picayune*, another influential Southern journal, seems not to fear the suffs any more than Mr. Sisson of Mississippi did. The *Picayune* said recently:

"The blacklisting of Congressman Sisson and others by the leading suffragettes of the North need cause them no uneasiness so far as the South is concerned. Down here it will be regarded as a badge of honor, rather than a cause for alarm. In Mississippi the progress of the movement has been slow, and a few more unwise acts by the leaders will kill it off entirely."

Frau Rosika Schwimmer, secretary of the International Suffrage Alliance, spoke in a saloon at Columbus, Ohio. The owner and four others introduced her.

"It gave me a splendid opportunity to make clear that the suffrage party has no affiliations with either the wet or dry interests," she said.

It seems that the 140,000 or more men of Missouri, who defeated woman suffrage in that state recently, were surely enough from that very state.

No one could have been more at home at the Nashville Convention of the suffs than Christabel.

Why I Am Opposed to Woman Suffrage

Hon. Harold J Hinman, then Chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the New York Assembly, 1912

One of the bravest as well as one of the wisest of addresses in opposition to woman suffrage was delivered by Hon. Harold J. Hinman, Chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the New York Assembly of 1912. It is worth reprinting now, being in fact as timely as ever. It is worth preserving: Assemblyman Hinman said:

If there is one thing settled in the long discussion of this subject, it is that suffrage is not a natural right, but is simply a means of government. The question is not one of right or of sentiment, but of practicability, and, reduced to its lowest terms, means this: Whether, in the most economical division of functions and labor between the sexes, the work of choosing governmental representatives can best be performed (for the good of the race as a whole) by both sexes or only by the men. The final answer in my judgment will depend chiefly on the ultimate decision of women as to what they themselves can best do.

I believe in equality of rights as between man and woman, but I also insist that the dissimilarity of function between them shall not be ignored. The effort to ignore such a patent fact is silly indeed.

There are four arguments used in favor of votes for women which are the main arguments but which do not convince me.

1. That the right to vote is in and of itself an inalienable right based on natural justice. As I have said, the vote is and always has been an acquired, not a natural right. Men and women alike have the right to a *just* government. Voting is only a means to that end. Civilization assumes that no nation or country has a right to misgovern itself, and none has been allowed to when the civilized world has undertaken to interfere. When the women have to look to the ballot for their protection rather than to their husbands, sons and fathers, then woman suffrage will be inevitable. But when I find the American woman of to-day, the average woman, is further in advance of the average woman of other countries, in social, educational, religious and industrial opportunities, than is any other class of our population, and all this without the ballot, I am bound to hold that there is no practical injustice in not granting women the vote.

2. The second argument used is that women are not represented under the present system—the "taxation without representation argument." The answer to it is that men do not vote *because* they are *taxpayers,* and an infinite amount of idle sentiment is displayed on this subject. Legislators are responsible to taxpayers, but there is no reason or precedent for the proposition that legislators must be responsible to *every* taxpayer in order to avoid taxation without representation. It cannot be turned into an *individual* right. Giving man the vote is nothing more than recognition of the fact that the government asks the man to accept the responsibility of maintaining it, of preserving its very existence. A government owes its existence not to the obedience of its subjects, not to the taxes it receives, but to the fact that the men of the state will come to the support of the state. Taxpaying is not the basis for determining the right of suffrage. That

theory was exploded ages ago. We have corporations, minors, non-resident and unnaturalized persons who pay heavy taxes, but we do not give them the right to vote. If it is just to one it is just to all.

Woman's influence in matters of legislation or administration, though one stage further removed, is no different generally from man's influence, and her influence has always been felt whenever women have chosen to make it felt.

I may be converted to woman's suffrage some day, but never on the simple theory of taxation without representation, particularly when there is no definite proposition to limit the vote to men and women of property.

3. The third argument is that voting is merely a matter of right and not a duty, too. I have dealt with the question of voting being a matter of right. The allegation that the right to vote does not carry with it the corresponding obligation to exercise that right is only a specious argument to confound and confuse those who feel as I do, that we are here bound to consider the wishes of the women who do not want to vote as well as those who do.

Where they do not want it by at least a reasonable majority the suffrage should not be forced upon them. It is an idle answer to say that a woman who does not desire a vote need not use it. The very essence of her objection is that the right to vote imposes upon her a duty which may be an intolerable burden and subjects her to the rule of women, whom she deems incompetent to exercise this power.

Women as a whole have a right to be consulted on the question whether they shall be given votes or not, and the very women who are now saying that the right to vote does not carry its corresponding obligation would be the first to remind the indifferent woman voter of her duty to meet that obligation. The enthusiastic suffragist of to-day would be the persistent doorbell puller of to-morrow, and the woman who is opposed to the suffrage will find no peace on primary day, on registration day, and on election day until she consents to go to the polls to perform the duty which comes with the right to vote.

I therefore believe that I have not only the right to consult the wishes of all women on the question, but if a majority of the women of this state do not want it, it is my duty to represent them rather than the few or comparatively few women who desire it.

Moreover, those who desire it are asking for an extraordinary change in our fundamental law, and I feel justified in saying that the burden is upon them, the proponents of the change, to demonstrate beyond peradventure that the majority of the women of this state want this change. It is not for me to prove to the contrary.

4. The fourth argument in favor of woman's suffrage is that government will be better if women have a more direct hand in it. This is a representative government, and I trust will always remain so. It is a complicated system under which a clear issue is seldom presented. Most of the questions are questions of business, not of morals. Most of our bad government in cities comes from insufficient attention to details even by business men who are dealing with somewhat similar problems. It is not apparent that women, trained and occupied by matters not similar to the business of government, will have more time and energy to give to understanding its details.

In regard to the moral questions in politics, women probably take *at present*

a higher stand than men; but that is because their point of view is more detached; they are not so concerned as to be anything but disinterested. But women have not proved to have any higher sense of honor than men when it comes to smuggling or tax-dodging. They have not shown that they respect more highly the majesty of the law or the rights of property than certain men of dynamiting fame. We have all been outraged by the stone-throwing and public chastisement of officials by the English suffragette, and our mortification is complete when we hear Dr. Anna Shaw and Mrs. Belmont, speaking for the American suffragette, declare that their war cry will soon be "Not stones and whips, but rifles and clubs. Not the breaking of windows, but the breaking of heads." When woman mingles in politics she will lose her present perspective and play the game in the same human way in which it is now played, no better, no worse. There will be a doubling of the vote without any change in the average excellence of that vote, either intellectually, morally or patriotically.

And on that subject I have only to quote Judge Lindsay, of the Juvenile Courts of Denver, who stated in an intervity in the *New York Times* a year or so ago, as follows:

"I have found that women in politics are no better and no worse than men. Don't forget that when a question narrows itself down to the breadline, to selfish interests, both sexes follow the same line of action—they look out for No. 1. If a woman wants to get a political job she will stand for iniquity; if she's afraid of losing her job, she'll do the same thing."

I cannot persuade myself that women are entitled to vote as a matter of right or that government will be any better if they have a hand in it.

I believe its importance is greatly overestimated, to put it mildly, and I for one am wholly unwilling to vote for it when I believe, and have every right to believe, that its adoption would be to force it upon an unwilling and very large majority of our women.

There is but one thing more that I would add. We have all been met by the proposition that instead of performing the duty which we came here to perform, instead of passing upon the proposition ourselves according to our best judgment, we shall have recourse to a weak and shuffling evasion. We are asked to pass favorably on this question in a perfunctory manner so that we may permit the people to make the determination which the Constitution exacts of us when it requires an amendment to be *"agreed to"* by the Legislature twice before submission to the people for *"approval and ratification."*

Why, Mr. Speaker, should we be asked to do it? From good nature, because my friend from New York, Mr. Murray, is a good fellow, because it will be pleasing to this or that lady, to do it for reasons of kindliness, of complaisance, all of them reasons opposed to the simple performance of the duty which we came here to discharge under the Constitution which we have sworn to support and defend.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that this House will discharge that duty faithfully in determining who shall have the right of suffrage; discharge it intelligently, manlike and decisively, not perfunctorily nor as a favor to anyone, not even to the committee which has made this report.

Perhaps Alice Stone Blackwell foretold a smashing suffrage success in Ohio on the theory that the contest would be settled purely in a moving picture way.

Meantime, Miss Jane Addams, who for so long a time has been the hull thing at Hull House, Chicago, wants to look out or she will lose her job.

REV. SHAW, THE NEW REV. BIRCHARD

They are beginning to call Rev. Anna Shaw the Birchard of the new dispensation. Birchard was the clergyman whom many believe to have been one at least of the causes for the defeat of James G. Blaine for the Presidency. Birchard declared at a public dinner in honor of the candidate that "Rum, Romanism and Rebellion" were in alliance against him. Hear the new reverend doctor:

> "We do not fear that little band of professional anti-women going around the country advocating home, heaven and mother. We are not at all disturbed by them. The only purpose they serve is that by holding out their skirts they act as a screen for the liquor traffic, the gamblers, the vicious and those interested in dance halls and places where young girls are ruined."

Rev. Shaw, speaking in Omaha, on the Friday before election said:

"After the election we will chase the Antis back to their kennels."

Miss Marjorie Dorman she characterized as a fool and Miss Minnie Bronson as "the biggest liar on earth."

DIDN'T EXTERMINATE THE DEMOCRATS

"With blare of trumpets and beating of drums," says the New York *World* editorially, "a certain contingent of Woman-Suffrage workers, with headquarters at Washington, set out during the recent campaign to exterminate the Democratic Party. Members of the Congressional Union invaded State after State on their mission of vengeance. They had registered a vow that the Democratic majority in Congress should be wiped out of existence because it had not responded eagerly to their demands that the Constitution of the United States be amended in a hurry. Even a list of their intended victims was published and plans made for the day of slaughter.

"Since election nothing has been heard of the triumphs scored by these semi-militant Suffragists. They are modestly silent. The Democrats have not complained of losses suffered through Suffragist attacks, and the Republicans have not manifested gratitude for gains due to their assistance."

THE EUGENIC CHILD

McLandburgh Wilson, in the New York Times.

A most eugenic baby came
To be his parents' blessing;
He took a prize as soon as born,
Perfections all possessing.
He grew to boyhood's happy age,
All cups and ribbons taking,
With not one virtue, great or small,
Omitted in his making.

And yet his parents took no pride,
But rather were they nettled;
At thought of him a heavy gloom
Upon his father settled.
And when she viewed his flawless whole
A grouch obsessed his mother;
He did not have a single fault
To blame upon each other.

HOW THEY DEFY THE DEMON RUM

The *Woman's Voice*, official organ of the Montana W. C. T. U., says:

"Our W. C. T. U. had no division in the suffrage parade during fair week. Our committee was arranging for float, banners, etc., according to invitation given, when our chairman was informed that some suffragists thought it better not to have the W. C. T. U. in the parade as a body. It is laughable to have the suffragists so considerate of the views of the liquor men that they fear to antagonize them by allowing a temperance banner in their parade. But such is their policy."

Hon George Gray, of Delaware, opposes woman suffrage before the Grange, but that isn't the way the suffragist press agents will get it into the papers.

Miss Helen Todd, of California, plays the bugle for the suffs in West 48th St., recalling Gilbert's lines:

"When the enterprising bugler is a bugling,
The policeman's lot is not a happy one."

Mother Teachers

John B. Huber, A.M., M.D.

The New York Department of Education has been considering the question of not permitting mothers, or wives about to become mothers, to teach in our public schools. This action has caused considerable opposition, the nature of which I beg to consider.

The Board "seeks to penalize motherhood." This is a familiar, a wicked and a yellow-journalism play to the galleries. Motherhood and motherhood-becoming are the happiest and the most absorbing of human relations. The race is in a bad way indeed if this relation and its demands are slighted. No other activity should be pursued at the same time with motherhood, and every right-feeling woman will agree to this. Motherhood takes, or ought to take, practically all a woman's time, and it is worth the time and the energy and all the devotion a woman is capable of. This fact is by far the world's best and most reliable asset; and to ignore it, as the feminists do, is just madhouse and hideous perversity.

What's the use—what idiocy is it—to try and get around physiology? It is several months before the infant's blessed coming (of course it is naturally a blessed coming to natural people) that its mother cannot teach, unless sex hygiene is so thoroughly taught to boys and girls that she may complacently appear before them in the obvious physical condition immediately preceding maternity. The infant, being born, should be bottle-fed only under rare and extremest pathological maternal conditions; otherwise, anything else than the breast means a decadent, a shabby and a vulgar civilization. The new-born infant must be nourished every two hours; for months afterwards, every three to four hours; it ought not to be weaned under a year. For fifteen months, then, the matron who keeps on teaching is cheating infanthood, motherhood and teacherhood.

The situation arouses several other reflections. Married women (the fact is on record) have given false names and have denied their motherhood to the Education authorities, posing as single women in order to retain their positions. Have we as a people got so low that we do not consider this dishonesty? And is a woman who either tells or acts a lie fit to teach our children in the public schools?

And—I had almost forgotten so trivial a point—what is, all this time, the husband of that mother-teacher doing? Why is he not, man-fashion, supporting her in her home, whilst she is preparing those baby dresses and so on; what is the reason he is not performing that absolutely most elemental of masculine duties? If he is not, what does his love for her amount to? Does he conclude that there is no occasion, since the tax-payer is supporting her and the infant, and perhaps maintaining him also into the bargain? Or can't he get, by reason of the fact that women have entered the economic field against him and have got, the work that would naturally be his?

And has it occurred to anybody what our schools are really for; what the citizen body in the Metropolis are putting up every year several score millions for? Are the schools conducted on behalf of mothers, or of infants, or of husbands who won't work or can't get work? No; the public schools exist for the benefit of the school children.

ONLY FALSEHOOD IN THIS MOVING PICTURE PLAY

It was inevitable that some lawyer, and perhaps more than one, should take pains to expose the detestable falsehoods of the photo-play "Your Girl and Mine," which "Rev." Shaw acted in and Mrs. Medill McCormick is believed, with her bottomless purse, to have financed. Mr. Edward Toale, of Ardmore, Pa., is apparently the first to do this. He writes a letter to the New York *Tribune*, (pro-suffrage), reaching this conclusion:

Here is a story, put forth in all seriousness to deceive the public, which is misled into believing that woman is so "enslaved" that she must pay her husband's debts and that he can will away her children. No specified state in which these presumed laws exist is mentioned in the play; consequently, it is so much the more deceiving, as it would tend to impress an audience that such legislation is general. I believe that the property of a wife cannot be seized for her husband's debts in any state In all the states, when husband and wife do not agree as to the custody of the children, the law gives them over to the mother, with a view to their best interest. Neither parent has absolute right to the custody of the child; nor has the husband an absolute right to appoint by will a guardian of the person of the children. Let the suffragists explain why they are disseminating these false doctrines. It's their duty to a misinformed and misguided public.

BARBARY COAST AND PACIFIC COAST

The San Francisco *Examiner* (Hearst) reported on the day after the California election that "McDonough Brothers had several automobiles busy all day long hauling Barbary Coast dance hall girls and the inmates of houses on Commercial street to the different booths, and always the women were supplied with a marked sample ballot."

And Mayor Rose, of Los Angeles, characterized the recent election as a disgrace to the nation (Taxes and divorce have both increased in California since women became voters.)

A letter from a California matron of fifty has reached New York. This lady keeps servants but prefers to take care of her own house. She is an active church-worker and an ardent prohibition advocate. This is what getting the vote has done for her—and, incidentally, what she is doing for it:

"I have been so busy studying amendments. We had forty-eight state and two county amendments to vote on. I was elected a delegate to the County Federation of Women's Clubs, held in San Bernardino. I have just written up my notes ready to report at Current Events. I am on the philanthropic committee. We're going to help the George Jr. Republic with sheets, towels, etc.

"I've been up late for weeks, studying or discussing politics."

Poor dear!

An Upper Montclair feminist believes in providing a preparatory course for the practice of the profession of wife and mother, quite agreeing probably that the curricula ought to include various courses in free love.

The membership committee of the New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage reports a monthly addition of a thousand new names to the membership rolls; and this is going some, and better.

Women Do Not Want the Suffrage

Gilbert M. Tucker

One of several objections to the female-suffrage fad, each of which is of itself sufficient to condemn the proposal absolutely in the mind of any unprejudiced person, is that those who oppose it are the defenders of the real women in the enjoyment of one of their most valuable rights, the right of exemption from the duty of studying party politics.

By "real women" is meant the enormous majority of the women of the country, the women whom we all love and honor, the kind of women whom you could not persuade, by any possible inducement, to have their names posted on the verandas of country road-houses of doubtful character as proposing to address miscellaneous audiences of men on any political topic whatever; the kind of women that compose the Anti Association of Albany, who have organized a branch of the Red Cross Association, and who, dropping temporarily all anti-suffrage work, are devoting their rooms, their time and their energies to making garments and the like for the sufferers from the war, while the suffragettes of the city have not as a body raised a finger, but continue to talk to everybody who will listen.

As to the duty of studying party politics, it must be remembered that that duty rests imperatively on every voter, and the voter who neglects it, like the voter who neglects to study proposed amendments to the constitution, is unworthy of citizenship in a republic and ought to live under a despotism.

That the enormous majority of the women of the country do not want to vote is admitted by the suffragettes themselves, admitted in two ways. One is their violent opposition to every plan for taking a vote of the women on the subject; nothing (unless it be the question whether they admire the malignant furies of England) so stirs their wrath as such a proposal. The other admission was made, inadvertently, no doubt, in the official report presented at the Washington meeting of the Suffrage Association, stating that that body had the support of "nearly eight per cent of the women of the country." (Analysis of the figures on which this statement was based showed that it was much exaggerated, but one need not insist on that point—the fraction is petty enough as it stands.)

Everybody knows that the other 92 per cent, say twelve women out of thirteen, are by no means indifferent to the question, a large proportion of them actively opposing the suffrage plan. The Anti socties, with female membership only, are fast overtaking in membership the suffrage societies, though the former, as organizations, are only four or five years old, while the latter have been pressing a vigorous propaganda for two generations and more. It would appear, as nearly as the facts can be gathered, that the national Anti association has gained some thirty thousand members during the last year, the New York State Association is growing at the rate of at least a thousand members per month; and so it goes generally. Excepting a noisy minority, so extremely petty in comparison with the rest that it is to be treated, in any calm view of the case, as utterly negligible, the women of the country will never consent to the proposal of bringing them, willy-nilly, into the electorate.

Now, then: did any rational being, in

any country on earth, at any stage of the world's history, or under any circumstances, ever seriously propose to confer the privilege or impose the duty of the suffrage on any class of people whatever among whom there was determined, organized and fast increasing resistance to receiving it? It is the most preposterous, wrong-headed, crazy proposal with which the electorate has ever been bothered.

"ANOTHER OLD WOMAN" FOR THE BENCH

Mrs. Lizzie Sheldon, of Lawrence, according to the Kansas City *Star,* who was one of the candidates for associate Justice of the Kansas Supreme Court this year, says she was in Wyandotte County campaigning and asked a man if he would vote for her. He readily said he would. Mrs. Sheldon went on to thank him for his kindness, and proposed to make the best judge she knew how. The man shoved her aside with:

"Oh, that's all right. I just want to put another old woman on the bench to keep Judge Blank company."

WOMEN DOING GOOD WITHOUT THE VOTE

Thanks to the Women's Municipal League, of Boston, the legislature has passed and the governor signed a bill providing that no basement or cellar room shall be occupied for living purposes unless it is at least 8½ feet high in every part, has at least one window in open space, that the floor and walls are dampproof, and that it is at least 60 per cent above the level of the highest ground within 15 feet of the outside wall. The bill took effect October 1. This excellent piece of legislation was secured with little difficulty by women without the vote.

NEGLECTED: A GLORIOUS OPPORTUNITY

"The suffragists," says the Washington correspondent of the *World,* writing about the most aggressive lobby seen in Washington for years, that of the Prohibitionists, "are studiously avoiding the Capitol until the liquor question is out of the way, for they do not wish to appear to be on either side in the controversy."

SHE MOTHERED FIVE

Her name may be unknown save to a few,
Of her the outside world but little knew;
But somewhere five are treading virtue's ways,
Serving the world and brightening its days.
Somewhere are five who, tempted, stand upright,
Clinging to honor, keeping her memory bright.
Somewhere this mother toils and is alive
No more as one, but in the breasts of five.
—Edward A. Guest, in Detroit Saturday Night.

By adding seven electoral votes from two Mormon states the female sufffragists bring the total up to ninety-one; but "It's a long way to Tipperary!"

The woman suffrage forces may bury the hatchet, oh, editor of the *Tribune,* but they will never stop pulling one another's hair.

"Irate Suffragists Hiss A. R. Conkling," says one of the headlines. Does anything more need to be said?

Mrs. James Lees Laidlaw got her name in the paper recently; also Mr. James Lees Laidlaw.

Desperate Socialists, Desperate Suffragists

It is apparent that those leading suffragists who have felt the burden of the Socialist incubus and wish to shake it off are going to have no easy time of it. The Socialists themselves don't propose to be shaken off! Like all other agitators, these foxy and determined revolutionists understand perfectly well that every agitation against an accepted order of things no matter how good helps along the work of destruction by co-operating with every other agitation; hence the complete appropriateness of the suffragist-feminist-Socialist-I. W. W. collective agitation. There is plenty of proof that the Socialists will never give up the suffrage ship.

The Socialists began their open co-operation with the suffrage movement in the Washington suffrage parade. The Socialists carried a banner saying, "1,000,000 Socialists vote and work for suffrage." The recent suffrage victory in Nevada was entirely due to the Socialists and the I. W. W.'s.

Nevada has a population about the size of the city of Lowell, Mass. About 6,000 votes were cast at the recent election. With the aid of the saloonkeepers, who have been publicly thanked by some of the suffrage leaders for their help, and of the Socialists and the I. W. W.'s who are very strong in Nevada, something over 3,000 votes were cast for suffrage.

The New York *Call*, the organ of the Socialists, printed the following:

"RENO, Nev., November 5—Woman suffrage has carried Nevada by fully 1,500. The victory is due to the united Socialist vote which went solidly for suffrage. The Socialists campaigned steadily and effectively for suffrage and to them goes the credit for its victory."

The vote for suffrage in Missouri was the lowest of all in the campaign states. However, one fashionable ward in St. Louis voted for suffrage. The same New York *Call* said:

"The enthusiasm of Socialists does not cool even when suffrage becomes a fad among the wealthy, when the society columns are filled with reports of fashionable teas. How many a society belle would tremble if she knew with what mighty forces she had put her feet in line, and what was the ultimate goal of her latest fad!"

Another count in the indictment: The Women's Committee of the Socialist Party of New York recently decided to unite with the Woman Suffrage Party in a fight to bring about an amendment to the State Constitution providing for woman suffrage in case the Legislature does not call for a referendum.

This meeting was rather interesting. Ludwig Lore, of the *Volkszeitung*, spoke on the political aspect of the question. He said that far too many Socialists were lukewarm on the question of woman suffrage.

"Those who are opposed to it are not Socialists at all," he said, "and those who are only lukewarm on this fundamental Socialist principle differ from the first lot only in degree."

Laura G. Cannon told of her work in the suffrage campaigns of Nevada and Arizona.

"There was one thing in connection with this, however, that caused me sorrow and astonishment," she said, "and that is that in spite of the strong stand taken for suffrage by all the Socialist candidates in these states, the Socialist vote fell far below my expectations on the suffrage amendment.

"They say that the Socialists claim to be suffragists, and then go back on them at the polls. This was said some years ago when suffrage was defeated in Oregon, and the vote of the Socialists justi-

fied this statement. As a matter of fact, I do not think that these votes were the votes of the tried and true Socialists. It is our duty to make the multitude understand what a bedrock cornerstone of this philosophy suffrage is."

Anna A. Maley said:

"We are suffragists because we are Socialists. It is up to us to get in and get suffrage for our women before it becomes to the interest of the master class to give the vote to women because they need it to whip the working class."

Max Eastman, the well known suffragist, feminist and Socialist, says: "This war will aid the feminist movement tremendously. The women will assume responsibilities, and when peace is declared they will refuse to relinquish them as they have done after past wars. If the war is prolonged the women will unquestionably be running the business of Europe before long. They will be getting the biggest opportunity in their history. Once in they will not be put aside."

In the New York *Times* not long ago appeared the following quotation from a suffragist:

"I neither believe in God nor man, although brought up a Roman Catholic. The church, in my opinion, has been the great agency in holding back women. The best thing ever done in England and the most hopeful sign in the suffrage movement is the burning of churches. Votes are not the whole scheme. They are but the means to an end. You American men think there is no militancy here, but just fail to give us the vote in 1915 and you will see militancy like England."

The same Max Eastman in a recent number of his magazine, *"The Masses,"* publishes a poem called "God's Blunder" in which occur these lines:

A dump marked "Church" and a hole marked "home"
And a doll called "mother" that boxed your jaws,
And a bubble "wealth" of shivering foam
And the precious toys called "Codes" and "Laws."
Also: Stooping God stumbled and almost swore
He almost let ou a ripping damn.

The National Suffrage Association puts Eastman's writings high in the list of "what to read on woman suffrage."

SUGGESTION: THE WAY OUT FOR ANNA SHAW BRIDES

"So you defy me? Did you not promise to love, honor and obey?"

"I was married on that platform," admitted the wife, "but conditions have altered and I shall have to repudiate some of its planks."—Louisville Courier-Journal.

So Christabel is with us now, to Mrs. Belmont's glee,
Who generously houses her and gives her fodder free;
We comprehend the latter's joy, the radiance she doth get
From harboring at any time a Pankhurst suffragette!

It appears that Jerome K. Jerome, once an enthusiastic suffragist, now admits that he was mistaken as to the main proposition; and if Mr. Jerome keeps on long enough, he may yet write a novel with real characters in it.

"Women love energy and grand results, the principle and its goal, but they are ignorant of the long road that leads to that goal, appreciating neither the time nor the continuity of effort necessary."—*Bulwer.*

Ida Husted Harper (Mrs. or Miss?) is rapidly become The Merry Jester of the female suffrage court.

A card of REPLY advertising rates will be sent free and gladly to any correspondent.

Hon. Herbert Parsons as the Great White Hope of New York Suffragists

If Hon. Herbert Parsons has a law practice—as possibly he may not have, or if he has it, possibly he doesn't need it—he must look to it, for evidently the suffragists intend to make him their Great White Hope, and that will keep him very busy.

"There are," he says to the ladies at the Suffrage Shop—and it may be that certain ladies' tailors and man milliners "were also present," "5,000 election districts in the State of New York. If you have 5,000 women who are willing to get out and work, allot one district to each of these women. Let each woman see that every man in her district is called upon and his answer recorded. If he argues against equal suffrage, go back to him, meet his arguments. Politicians know that a candidate with poor qualifications who makes a thorough personal canvass stands a better chance than a man with better qualifications who neglects this."

But all that glistens is not gold, apparently. An apologist for the poll of New York men, which suffragists canvassers have made with a view to deciding a sufficiently long time before election that the state is going for suffrage, admits that she doesn't know whether the reports of these canvassers "give any clue to what the vote on the suffrage amendment will be." She admits that frequently the canvassing is done among one's friends and acquaintances, and it is just possible—indeed, the implication is that it is likely—that the men who sign are "only jollying us." Moreover, the confession is made that many men often tell the suffragist canvassers that others—men, the mean things, of course!—sign the yellow slips when they are lying outright. So the vanishing canvasser, if not the vanishing lady.

A curious manifestation of the double-cross which some of the real politicians, or some of the real political workers, have given the innocent though possibly well-meaning suffs happened in New Jersey. The New York *Sun* gives an account of certain expensive and expansive "surveys" which certain uplifters, provided any one with the money will meet the pay-roll, will make for you anywhere in reference to anything, and says:

"So far as can be learned the only damage done in New Jersey was to the financial backers of the woman suffrage movement, who paid to the researchers fancy fees for keeping them posted on the status of the proposed suffrage amendment to the State Constitution. The legislative committee of the suffragists had found by experience that something more than intelligence, watchful waiting and persistence was required if they hoped to be successful, and therefore they gave up several hundred dollars for information that could have been obtained from the daily papers or that any one of the dozen or more 'legislative agents' who hang about Trenton when the Legislature is in session would have been glad to furnish for $10 or $15.

"But the suffragists did not know. They had seen their amendment passed by both houses by a practically unanimous vote at the 1913 session, only to learn along in July of that year that the concurrent resolution had never reached the Department of State and no preparation had been made to advertise it. Then there was trouble, and when the amendment was finally recovered from the safe in the executive department with the explanation that somebody had blundered, it was too late for the official advertising. To protect themselves against any further 'mistakes' the committee in charge employed an agent of the uplifters."

These considerations have to do with the case because they seem to be teaching some of the more practical of the suffragists that there is something to the ballot besides putting a piece of paper into a box. There is the little political chore which Hon. Herbert Parsons men-

tioned, namely, the thorough canvass of 5,000 election districts, and, mind you, this canvass, in order to be effective in the sense in which mere men would expect it to be effective, must provide against the jolly and the double-cross, terms which must rapidly come into vogue in a sort of bi-sexual sense when once the women really go to canvassing in dead earnest. How can they tell the jolly when they see it; and if they seldom recognize the double-cross even after they have seen it, how are they going invariably to recognize it beforehand and provide against it? And when the canvasses and the primaries are over and they come to the real tasks of election morning, how are they going to dispose of them victoriously? Will they personally hitch up old Dobbin and take the neighboring farmer and his wife to the polls? Will they personally drive the automobiles, and if not, will they hire chauffeurs? And if they hire chauffeurs, will they not be accused, and justly, of siding with the despised rich; and hence will they not fail of their chief objective, which is to save the downtrodden? And when they come to that peculiarly important variety of snappy work required to be done at the polls themselves, will they proceed independently of the men, singly or in teams themselves, or will they seek to add the men, or some of them, to their staffs, and if the latter, how will they do it? By cajoleries or threats, we wonder? Or by a mixture of the two?

It isn't so easy to prevail at the polls on election day by threats, for threats are a masculine bluff if not backed up by force, potential if not active; and that would be true of the feminine bluff. Shall it be by cajoleries and feminine sweetnesses, then? This horn of the dilemma involves its dangers. How far would the female workers at the polls incline to go with their cajoleries and sweetnesses and solicitations?

Miss Mabel Rainsford Haynes, who gets away with the title of Corresponding Secretary of the New Jersey State Women's Political League, declares that in states where suffrage has been granted "the fair sex" conditions are far superior to those in states where only the men vote. And here evidently is another lady who doesn't care what she says.

The National American Woman Suffrage Association declared before going to its Nashville Convention, "Our task will be to formulate judgment on these great issues of the day which nearly concern women," and then they went to Nashville, and didn't formulate a judgment on a single one of the great issues of the day!

Mrs. Rose Murphy, a suffrage woman, ran for Congress in Kansas, and ran third. So, while this lady may have been an early Rose Murphy, she evidently wasn't an early Rose Murphy enough.

Mrs. Medill McCormick dismisses the Washington press agent of the suffragists, having evidently become so famous now that nothing of the kind is necessary.

Dr. Carey Thomas urges the official board of the National Suffrage Council to start an official organ. Why not "touch" Mrs. Catt, Dr. Carey Thomas?

If "Rev." Anna Shaw keeps it up much longer, she may yet become the Little Bright Eyes of all the woman-suffrage picture plays.

Mormonism as the Mainstay of Suffragism in the Inter-Mountain Country

The fact that two new states, both strongly under the influence of the Mormon church, have declared for female suffrage serves to remind a number of authoritative observers of the biggest fact of all, that female suffrage would have amounted to little or nothing in the Inter-Mountain country but for the dominance of the Mormons, so many of whom still believe in polygamy and practise it when not detected. Mrs. Albert T. Leatherbee, of Boston, writing to the *Sun*, says:

"A letter in the *Sun* quotes the following from a resident of Reno:

'Where the homes are suffrage was beaten; where the men are alone in the mining camps and where socialists and Mormons are is where we find the majorities favoring it.'

"The connection here implied between Mormonism and suffrage attracts instant attention, and it is interesting to note the assertion of the Gentile Salt Lake *Tribune* in the spring of 1912 to the effect that the Mormon Church has 'the controlling voice in the politics of Idaho, Wyoming and Arizona, and strong political influence in Colorado, Nevada, Oregon and Montana,' besides its 'diamond cinch upon the politics of Utah.' All these states are to-day shown white on the suffrage map.

"In case there is any doubt as to the support given suffrage by Mormonism, in a letter to the New York *Times*, dated May 20, 1913, Robert E. Pratt, a Mormon missionary, said he welcomed the charge that the Mormon Church was the originator of the votes for women idea in this country: 'Utah initiated woman's suffrage with her own Statehood * * * we ardently hope to see the idea spread down from our mountain country even to the Eastern as it has already swept to the Western sea.'

"At a public suffrage meeting held here at Tremont Theatre Miss Margaret Foley, speaking of her experiences in the Nevada campaign, told of having spoken in three Montana towns, and said: 'I got every Mormon vote in those towns!' That is undoubtedly correct."

Annie Riley Hale writes the *Tribune*:

"If Miss Ward (the English suffragist) and her associates want the real, historic reason why woman suffrage has prospered more in the Western than in the Eastern portion of the United States, they will find it most graphically and powerfully set forth in a play now running in New York whose motif is the exposition of the Mormon system. All suffragists should see "Polygamy," because of the luminous example it gives of the ballot as the instrument of women's liberation!

"As all who know the history of woman suffrage in this country know, the Mormon women have had it longer than any others, and but for the Mormon need to retain control of Mormon state officials it may be questioned whether the woman ballot would have yet obtained a foothold in the United States.

"And all who have kept tab on the spread of Mormonism in the West know that far more closely and invariably than 'the American Constitution follows the flag' has woman suffrage followed the trail of the Mormon hierarchy."

The National Woman Suffrage Association worked energetically to secure a re-election for Senator Smoot, of Utah. Antoinette Funk, vice-chairman of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, wrote an open letter to the

women of Utah asking them to give their support to Mr. Smoot.

We of New York have lately been warned against a Mormon invasion, and urged to join in a nation-wide movement for the suppression of polygamy, by Frank J. Cannon, who was the first United States Senator from Utah and was brought up in the Mormon faith. Mr. Cannon came East on the invitation of the New York City Federation of Churches to start an anti-Mormon campaign.

"We have from the utterances of the head of the Mormon movement in this city," Mr. Cannon says, "the definite assurance that the Mormon Church is prepared to build a tabernacle in this city."

Twenty-five hundred Mormon missionaries are making this their Eastern headquarters, according to ex-Senator Cannon. Hundreds of them were driven from Europe by the war, while others were expelled even before that by decrees of European Governments.

"If the people of the United States do not do something pretty soon to the Mormon Church," he went on, "the Mormon Church is going to do something to the United States. It is the best organized institution in the world; its political net is out in every State. It not only holds Utah in its grip, but holds the balance of power in Idaho and Wyoming, while it exerts a most powerful political influence in Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Washington, Montana, and Oregon. It has 300,000 priests, and its 2,500 missionaries in this part of the country are never idle. It is not a church but a kingdom, a dangerous temporal power whose evil influence has been recognized by practically every Government of Europe.

"There has been no accounting of funds in the possession of the prophet of the church in eighty years. This fund to-day is probably the largest mobile mass of money in existence under one direction. It must be enormous, containing, as it does, the accumulated 10 per cent tithes exacted of Mormon followers for more than two generations. Ordinarily it amounts to more than $4,000,000 a year, and the prophet's income is probably over $12,000,000 yearly."

The reason why the Mormon church has propagated woman suffrage so industriously and successfully is clear enough. No church organization, indeed no organization at all, not even Tammany Hall, has developed so thorough and so efficient a political and business machine. Old Brigham was a marvel at managing his subjects through a gratification of their material ambitions as well as their sexual desires, and just as the Mormon church controls the politics and business of its subjects, so it controls the political actions of its women. The Mormon women as well as the Mormon men act on the same political impulses and under the same boss rule wherever the Mormons go. This, of course, cannot be said of any other denomination, or indeed of any other political or business organization. Hence the more the women vote in the different Inter-Mountain states where the influence of "the Saints" is felt, the more surely the church will continue to exercise its power. The fact that the Mormon church is suffragist is one of the best of all arguments against suffrage, not merely because the fact itself is that an organization, often disloyal to the Government, ranges itself on one side of a given question, but because it surely indicates how naturally any organization which can deliver its own people in block agitates by no matter what means, and fights for anything which will strengthen and expand that power.

Miss Margaret Foley and Her Rough and Drunken Miners of Nevada

The photograph of Miss Margaret Foley (which has leaked out somehow) indicates that this ath-a-letic suffrage worker would not be stampeded easily. And yet it is doubtful if the lady returns to Nevada immediately, especially since one of her interviews about the suffrage campaign "out there," having been printed in Boston and sent to certain Nevada editors, must, in the opinion of these gentlemen, have prevented even the meager success of the suffragists in that state if it had been printed there before election.

"It was a wonderful adventure," said Miss Foley to a Boston *Record* reporter, "and had a splendid result, but I absolutely wouldn't go through it again for $1,000,000, as bad as 'the cause' wants funds."

The reporter pauses here to say that there can be no doubt that Massachusetts' most powerful woman spellbinder, "the woman with the punch," was the one biggest force in getting the ballot for the women of Nevada. Then he lets her go on.

"It all seems like a dream, a dime novel, a moving picture," Miss Foley declared. "They all laughed at me when I landed out in Nevada and declared that I was going to visit every mining camp in the state. U. S. Senator Pitman, one of the hardiest of campaigners, told me I was crazy, and if I attempted to carry out my itinerary, I would find myself in some of the worst mining camps in the country. Well, I left him behind early. He was worn out, blear-eyed and exhausted, voice gone, and he couldn't even reach Austin.

"I slept in sheds, without any bedclothing, no locks on the doors and nothing but canvas partitions in the hotels, when there was a hotel at all. And when there was they were always full of drunken miners.'

Papers all over Nevada indignantly took up this interview for discussion. The Carson City *News* said, under the caption, "Truthful Margaret":

"Miss Margaret Foley is a lady with a stentorian voice and an ability at stretching the truth to such an extent that the aforesaid truth snaps and places the lady in the category of those whom Roosevelt has assigned to the Ananias Club. Miss Foley was one of the imported women at a high price brought to the state by the suffrage leaders during the past campaign to tell the 'drunken miners' of Nevada how to be right and just to their women-kind. This political and physical Amazon girded her short skirts about her loins and kicked back to the effete east after her frightful experiences in the Silver State. . . . Margaret will probably never be hired to suffer in Nevada again, as she is not worth the money."

The Carson City *Appeal* said:

"Miss Foley, who spent several months in this state in the cause of woman suffrage, gives a detailed account of her doings in the rough and wild ends of the state. She says in her interview: 'I slept in sheds without any bedding, no locks on the doors and nothing but canvas partitions in the hotels, when there was a hotel at all, and when there was they were always full of drunken miners.' From the little that was noted of Miss Foley in this city it is believed that at no time was she in danger of molestation."

The Tonopah *Bonanza* said:

"Poor Miss Margaret Foley, who came all the way from Massachusetts to convert the barbarians of Nevada to equal suffrage, is to be pitied. She is now nursing a sore heel and bruised feelings, according to her own unvouched story. The lady declares Nevada is the wildest of the wild western states, that the people are a lot of Yahoos, unkempt, uncivilized and who have fallen below the level of the brutes. * * * The poor, dear, sweet, overripe hen is cackling about something she knows is absolutely false or she is allowing her name to be used for the purpose of convincing the public that Nevada is a place unfit for decent people. She declares she visited every mining camp in the state. Some of these had only five inhabitants, and that she had to travel in the company of drunken miners whose

company she would not endure again for a million dollars. This is plain talking, and the plain people of this state may understand how they are regarded by the imported orators sent here by eastern interests."

The Winnemucca *Silver State* said:

"Miss Foley, an eastern militant suffragist, who participated in the recent Nevada campaign, has rushed into print, telling of her terrible experiences while visiting the mining camps of this state. She tells hair-raising stories of the rides she was compelled to take, in company with drunken miners, and states that she would not go through the experience again for a million dollars. In explanation of their condition at the times mentioned, the miners explained that they were obliged to take the ride with the female gladiator and simply fortified themselves for the ordeal."

WHEN IN DOUBT CONSIDER THIS

"And we further suggest," says the Newark *Sunday Call*, "that women who are in doubt consider carefully whether they feel themselves equal to all the responsibilities involved, the study of political conditions required, the knowledge of candidates desirable, the labor of primary work and election necessary, the attendance at meetings and the like. It is not a sufficient answer to this suggestion that many men who have the right to vote do not perform all their duties as citizens."

WANT IT, GET IT, NEGLECT IT

Much as men shirk the ballot and dodge their responsibility at the polls, says the Brooklyn *Times*, women, in states where they are allowed to vote, are much more serious offenders. In other words, an earnest and effective plea is put up for the ballot, and when the right is conferred on women, hundreds of their most intelligent leaders fail to exercise it. This argument is likely to have much weight with the men who vote on suffrage in this state next year.

Michael Monahan says: Let the feminist chew on this: Even under things as they are, there is a reserved hatred between the sexes. What will happen when the romance of sex s forgotten in a fierce strife between men and women, such as equal suffrage is sure to bring?

According to the Kansas City *Post*, Dr. Anna Howard Shaw declared in that city that she would rather be free and be damned than be a slave and be coddled and laden with jewels. It is not known, of course, whether this is an invitation or a threat by Dr. Anna Howard Shaw.

Neither is it to be expected that the grand old organ of grand old Alice Stone Blackwell will give a full account of that stirring scene in Worcester when the Massachusetts State Grange turned down the endorsement for woman suffrage.

The professors and assistant professors of Constitutional law in some of our formerly respectable colleges meet with just as many difficulties as extraordinary persons in wiggling their way out of their own suffrage inconsistencies.

The press agent, doubtless acting under orders of the theatre manager, springs the startling news upon us that Inez Milholland Boissevain is "the beautiful and well-known suffragette."

Real humor will attach to the national campaign of the suffragists now that Peter Finley Dooley and John Kendrick Bangs get new advertising by coming out for oats for women.

Dollar Watches, Democracy, Monopoly, Suffragism

Editor THE REPLY:

There has been published, doubtless by the suffragist literary bureau, a letter by Robert H. Ingersoll & Brother addressed to Hon. Everett P. Wheeler, chairman of the Man Suffrage Association. I have looked that letter over and believe it could be proved that neither Robert H. Ingersoll nor his brother "has anything on" Mr. Wheeler.

Robert H. Ingersoll & Brother declare their belief in the suffrage movement as one of the White Hopes of Democracy, and they refer to Colorado as illustrating the evils of monopoly, which is at the bottom "of these and other questions that concern not only manufacturers but society itself."

Mr. Ingersoll and his brother become intensely interesting when they discuss democracy and monopoly. These gentlemen, of course, are the architects of the dollar watch—and they don't care who knows it. They are understood to have been active in forming the so-called Fair Trade League (an organization thus far secret, so far as I know, as to its make-up), which has for many months past been seeking legislation at Washington. It seems that the dollar watch people, among others, found that certain persons who purchased these watches sold them at cut prices, and the vendors of the watches sought to stop and perhaps punish these cut-raters, and haled them into court; but a number of decisions, and one or more decisions by the United States Supreme Court, had it that when the vendor sold an article he sold it, that is, he parted with it entirely, and had no title in it or right to it further; and the buyer could do as he pleased with it. He could sell it at any price or at no price, or he could give it away.

Manifestly, this was a situation intolerable to those who wished to maintain the full retail price or re-sale price of the dollar watch. So legislation was sought legitimizing re-sale price maintenance, so-called. The bill for the purpose was beaten, but a Senator has charged on the floor of the Senate that the lobby employed by the dollar watch people and others kept to its work, industriously if not "insidiously," and injected into the Clayton Bill (for the further elucidation of the Sherman Anti-Trust Law) the phrase "unfair methods of competition" in place of the words "unfair competition," in order that the new Federal Trade Commission, which is to have the interpretation of the Clayton Law in a measure, might be encouraged—industriously, if not "insidiously"—to rule that the price-cutter—of the dollar watch and other articles—was resorting to "unfair methods of competition."

This effort, if successful, would of course mean that Robert H. Ingersoll & Brother had contributed materially to the swing towards democracy by adding suffragism to re-sale price maintenance; and it would follow, too, that a terrific and perhaps fatal blow would be delivered between the eyes of monopoly in Colorado and elsewhere.

It may be that Robert H. Ingersoll & Brother will yet realize that most women and probably all suffragists believe in bargains, and even in the bargain-counter rush, as probably in nothing else; and if women should really get the vote and should apply it in such a way that the price-cutter and the bargain house and

the bargain-counter rush would be regulated to their satisfaction through that priceless and inalienable boon, can you not see that Mr. Robert H. Ingersoll and also his brother would simply have their trouble for their pains?

If I were Mr. Wheeler, I would keep quiet about this and let them go it.

E. E. S.

POTATO HILL PHILOSOPHY

By E. W. Howe

It is now said by the women that perfect financial equality between husband and wife is for the husband to give his wife two-thirds of his income. Formerly, exact justice between husband and wife was half.

Rich and poor, great and humble, all complain that they are unable to control their children.

A subscriber writes me from Colorado: "I note that you do not care for female suffrage. You may be interested in knowing that a woman who recently ran for office in my town distributed more beer and whiskey than any other candidate."

Every woman is a little touchy about it if her husband likes baker's bread as well as he likes hers.

For the first time in its history, the school house (at Potato Hill) was so dirty the morning after the recent election that it was necessary to dismiss school to clean up and fumigate. And curiously enough, this was the first time the women voted.

The average man thinks he will not be considered a gentleman unless he says his wife made him.

After nearly every marriage the neighbor women offer gratuitous insult to the groom by saying: "And her mother had such high ambitions for her daughter!"

WHAT WOMAN MUST DO

Once man looked upon Woman as a goddess To-day he looks upon her as a female man.

The change of heart has not been wrought through any deteriorating physical or intellectual alteration, for both are higher and better in development than they were. Healthful sports—long life to them!—have been instrumental in the first; competition, a power in the latter.

Something, however, has been eliminated from Woman. What? I answer: Dignity is dead!

We worshipped Dignity. We despise its substitute known as Feminism; Feminism, flounted in a hundred ways.

A few of them? In dress, without dignity of design; in occupation, without dignity of poise; in amusement, without dignity of action.

Feminism will never regain the respect of Man and, without Man's respect, Woman can never stand on an equal footing with Man. With it She can stand above him.

To regain this position she must revert to the methods of her forbears, albeit, better equipped than they were, because of her increased intellectual and physical powers.

She MUST assume again the Robe of DIGNITY.

Homo.

Circumstances over which the lady clearly had no control have prevented Miss Florence Carman, of Freeport, Long Island, from acting lately as secretary of the local suffrage association.

It is very sad that McCall, suffragist, the one Republican candidate who was defeated in the recent election in Massachusetts, shrunk to that little measure; undoubtedly it will be his last chance.

How Candidates Made the Suffrage Black-List Help Them

It seems from a close view of the election returns that the blacklist of one section of the suffrage-feminists against the Democratic Party and of another faction against certain Senators and Representatives who refused to do their bidding that these amateur activities didn't work out well. The wilder their claims before election the more nearly empty they appear to have been afterwards. Their activities and especially their threats against given candidates often worked out for the advantage of those candidates, even. Many candidates cajoled them. It is not of record that any candidate thought it worth while to make his campaign with any reference to opposing them.

This year's decided defeat, coming in addition to those of 1912 and 1913 in Ohio, Wisconsin and Michigan, is all the evidence that any one needs to convince him that the franchise for feminists, like free silver, progressivism and other passing political theories, has been repudiated.

In the western states one anti-suffrage campaigner in each state was able to defeat the suffragists, who had at least ten in each state. The suffrage tactics antagonized many people, who objected to the personal attacks which were the basis of the suffragists' campaign. The suffragists could not answer the figures and arguments of their opponents, so they had to resort to personal abuse.

In Seattle the two emissaries sent to boycott the Democrats ran into a highly indignant "Woman's Democratic Club," which greeted them with a set of resolutions touching on "the boastful declarations of two wordy perpiatetic suffragettes bearing the earmarks and characteristics of the militant stripe," and declined to have anything to do with them.

Alice Paul, leader of the Congressional Union, wrote to Senator Thomas, of Colorado, a life-long friend of suffrage, that their opposition to him had nothing personal in it, but since he belonged to a party which had blocked their movement in Washington, it was necessary to oppose him. Senator Thomas replied:

"I can assure you that the opposition of your organization is proving a source of great strength to me, and I therefore beg that you continue it to the end. I can conceive of no greater force in my behalf with the good women of Colorado than the attitude assumed by your so-called organization."

Senator Thomas was re-elected.

A Democrat in Arizona wrote to the Rev. Anna Shaw:

"Miss Shaw, those fool women of the Congressional Union have sent Jane Pincus (Pinch-us, the Democrats call her!) to fight the re-election of Mark Smith and Carl Hayden. Our party leaders have threatened, if this movement is continued, to write to the campaign states and throw the strength of the Democratic Party against the suffrage movement."

In Massachusetts the suffragists joined in a campaign which ended with the loss of all of the state ticket, except the governor, the loss of all Democratic councilors but one, and the loss of almost 50 seats in the legislature. The Progressive Party, which made suffrage a corner stone of its issues, slumped out of existence.

Senator Andrew P. Boyle, of New Bedford, was blacklisted by the suffragists. He did not dodge the issue. Once the campaign started against him, he announced plainly that he was opposed to woman suffrage and that in the 1915

General Court he intended to vote and work against it if he was the only man who took such a stand. He was re-elected by a bigger vote than ever.

"One feature of the result of the last elections," writes Minnie Bronson, General Secretary of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage," is especially gratifying. The suffragists secured no state east of the Rockies; they have captured no territory in which the home wields the influence that it wields generally in the more populous states. Even in Nevada, in the larger towns where homes were most numerous, suffrage was defeated nearly two to one. The exceptions were the mining centers of Goldfield and Tonopah, where the Socialist vote was exceptionally strong. Out in the mining camps, where there were no women, particularly the small and isolated camps, the vote was practically unanimous in favor of suffrage. This is a confirmation of the contention of the anti-suffragists that women do not want the ballot. Suffrage was most overwhelmingly defeated where the most women were consulted."

JUDGE SNELL THINKS DIFFERENTLY NOW

E B. Snell, of Tacoma, Washington, for eight years judge of the superior court, writes that he voted for woman suffrage because he thought woman's vote would uplift politics, but he is convinced now that it was a mistake. He says: "If the question was submitted to woman alone and every woman was compelled to vote, I believe woman suffrage would be strongly defeated in Washington. Many women will not vote, while others vote from self-defense to offset the vote of the undesirable women who do vote."

UNIMPORTANT WHETHER TRUE OR NOT

Editor THE REPLY:

Can you tell me whether Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt is a wife or a widow, and from Kansas, and whether her husband's name was, or is, Thomas Catt?

Anxious Reader.

THE REPLY has understood that Mrs. Catt is from Kansas, but stands corrected if this is not true. It has no information as to the real name or present whereabouts of Mrs. Catt's husband. We say this in the utmost good nature, answering our inquirer out of courtesy, and not seeing that the information desired makes any difference one way or the other.

The credentials report of the recent Nashville convention of the suffragists indicates a national membership of 6,700; thus on the basis of the suffragist claim (false, it is true, but vociferous) that "four million women vote now," less than one-sixth of one per cent of them will join the national movement to enfranchise their sisters.

Poor girls!

It was bad enough when the Brooklyn Bureau of Public Charities would not accept baskets filled with yellow stuff from the suffragists, but when the so-called narrow-minded Lotus Club, in which Mr. James Lees Laidlaw confesses to being a shining light, turns a deaf ear and a cold door-step to reporters seeking to exploit a meeting of male female suffs in the club house, it is carrying matters pretty far.

A Case for Colonel Roosevelt, Perpetual Patriarch of the Ananias Club

William Jennings Bryan was a candidate for the Presidency three times, and was three times beaten. He has been a candidate for the applause of Chautauquans three thousand times, or three million times. His eloquence is very effective—as that of many an actor is—especially in his justly celebrated impersonation of the Prince of Peace. Mr. Bryan is now the Secretary of State in President Wilson's cabinet—our Premier, they sometimes call him. He has in a measure—or betweenwhiles, when he doesn't hear the yodlers calling—a Mexican situation on his hands; and if we manage to keep out of a war with one or more of the European Powers, that will not be because Mr. Bryan hasn't done his part nobly by keeping away from Washington—in times of crisis especially.

This man (whom we have given far too much space to describe) recently wrote an article for his paper (*The Commoner*, Lincoln, Nebraska, price a dollar a year, if we remember correctly, and doubtless at smaller figures if you subscribe for sufficient quantities), discussing woman suffrage. We call attention especially to two things that he said:

"The active opposition to woman's suffrage is to be found in the brewery, the distillery and the saloon, and when this fact is known, those who are associated with the anti-suffragists will inquire the cause."

"The bad are a unit against woman's suffrage. Every woman who profits by vice; every man who draws dividends on crime; every man who makes it his business to encourage sin of any kind—all these are by instinct opposed to woman's suffrage because they know that woman's conscience is against their business."

These are apparently deliberate utterances of William Jennings Bryan, Secretary of State. It may be that Mr. Bryan merely deserves to be called our juggler with words without an equal. Even so, we don't believe that he is entitled to write for *The Commoner*, no matter how badly it needs the circulation, nor for any other paper, nor for any stage, a collection of words in not a single one of which a vestige of truth can be found. It is not in order here to make a joke about the propriety of Col. Roosevelt's forcing the resignation of the present president of the Ananias Club, whoever he may be, and installing the present Secretary of State; it is just a little too serious for that. We can understand why a candidate for office, or an office-holder, or an actor, or even an imitation Prince of Peace, might slip up on the exact truth now and then; but why he should part company with it entirely, as if to let it alone forever, is beyond the comprehension of at least one woman—and we think of others.

It seems that representatives from the so-called campaign states present at the recent Nashville Convention of suffs united in a testimonial to Dr. Shaw, thanking her for the help that her eloquent addresses had been in carrying their states! Evidently the movement needs an official humorist, but he—or she—wouldn't be appreciated.

The Socialist editor of the New York *Evening Journal*, Mr. Arthur Brisbane, editorializes to the effect that the opponents of woman suffrage consider that the women of the country are actually inferior to the convicts in Sing Sing! Oh, Arthur! Mrs. Bisbane, or surely Mrs. Hearst, will bring you sharply to task for this.